In The United States District Court
For The Middle District OF Alabama VED
Northern Division 7006 MAR 30 A 9:43

Richard W. Wright, St., *
Plaintiff, Pro-Se., * Civil Action No:

VS * 2:05-CV-439-A-WO

SYLVester Nettles. et. al., *

Defendants. *

C.W.W.

Plaintiff Wright Written Response To Defendant's William Sanders and Mental Health Management Service, Inc. Special Report

COMES NOW, RICHARD WAYNE WRIGHT, SR., Plaintiff, Pro-Se., pursuant to this Court order requiring Plaintiff to Answer de-Fendant's Special Report.

Defendants are tring to Further Causing bewilderment in plaintiff mind in the Following manner. In defendant (3) mental Health Management Special report by Itheir J undersign Counsel Gregory F. Yaghmai stated: "Cattached here to as Exhibit "A") and the affidavet of William Sanders M.D. (attached here to as Exhibit "B"); (see defendants Mental

Health management's Special Reports); (see Page Two (2) paragraph one (1)). Plaintiff Wright did not get the medical records that reflect the treatment provide to the plaintiff Until March 8, 2006 as it was living.
Log in Thereil at Ventress Correctional Facility Chere after referred to as (V.C.F.)), Defendant William Sanders M.D. affoldavit was mixed in with the papers they Sent plaintiff through this attorney on March 8, 2006. Plaintiff Wright was wondering where are these Exhibits "A" and B" as were stated in their Special Report as 19sted above, When plaintiff Wright received the mail on March 6, 2004 and again on march 7, 2004. Plaintiff believes these defendants are Collectively devising these type of mental games to agongze plaintiff. Plaintiff Wright Wonders (is for did) this Honorable Court receive this affidavit attach as (Exhibits one (1)) as plagntaff receive which had no notary public authorization and/ or date in which de Fendant William Sanders Sworn to and or subscribed before a notary public. Plaintiff also wonders does this Honorable Court possess Copies of the Med9cal records of

Plaintiff'so that when plaintiff reFers to the medical records and lor
documents this Honorable Court may
be able to look at such documents
or does plaintiff need to send bish
Only Copy / Copies in hopes this
Honorable Court With Send Bind a
Copy back after Court Filing. What
ever makes thish Case less Complicated
For thish Honorable Court plaintiff
Wright Will Conform too, to the best
of bish ability.

DeFendant's Sanders and M.H.M. Inc. allege plaintiff Claims are with out merits because they are able (as they have also done) by producing additional medical documents in Which plaintiff Wright never had Knowledge OF. L See Exhibert two (2) and three (3)). Plantiff Wright not only Faced mail intercepting as in This I Complaint but Continues to Face that interception/entamperment of plaintiff Legal mail possible out going (For I'm renot receiving any response back From the Correspondent) and incoming legal mail has been open on two occations one time noted the other time in officer white presense While I was housed in the in-Firmary due to the assault I encounted

on November 23,2005. (See Exhibit Four (4) and plaintiff Wright Affidavit stating Legal mail tamperment by defendant(s)/agent (5) here at V.C.F.).

Plaintiff Wright shows this Honorable Court defendants scheduled For plainteff. L'Alabama Department of Correction Mental Health Service Notice of involuntary medication Hearing 7/See Exhibit Five (5)). Plaintiff Wright did not See any part of the administrative records and many portion of the mental Health Subsection, and medical care subsection Was absent at the time approximately February 25th, 2006.) defendant N. Burks made available certain parts of plaintiff préson Fêle and lor there after. In accordance With (Exhibit Five (5)) Substant Subsection listed," In this process you have the Following rights", Plaintiff Wright Was not not afforded the Following rights as stated on Exhibit the Subsection # 2, # 3, # 5, # 6, #7, #8 and #9. Due to the Seriousiness of the involuntary medication Hearing and understand (OF Dr. Hammer and [h95] assistance Mr. Steve ?) plagntiff explaination made reasonable sense l plaintiff Wright believes) because The I Was not again Force with an injection and for recommended For more psycho-tropic drugs by Whom ever" made such

Suggestion, Dr. Sanders, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Gorman, MHM., ect. DeFendants and/or DeFendants Counsel For MH.M Consist With mor members / team fore than) Dr. Sanders but The I is a part and partial OF (said) M. H.M. Tean in Which Collectively ordered psychotropic medication through an injection and by mouth For plaintiff Wright with mind altering drug which did alter plaintiff Wright thoughts. It appears that defendants and M.H.M. Team attempt to play hide and seek with plaintiff wright by not including their names on numerious documents in which had major effects on plaintiff mind and health. It appears this plot of Seek and Find as designed by These I prison officials and health Care providers and, M.H.M. team 45 a clever sceme to place Upon plaintiFF as a task with Lits' I limitation impose by prison restrictions and by not Submitting all mental health records. DeFendant M.H.M. 95 oliable under the doctrine of respondent Superior For Pr. Sanders actions and und Lack of actions. When in Fact plaintiff Wright was induce and injected with more psychotropic drugs that that which Dr. Sanders takes Claim For. In order For plaintiff Wright to Meet the eleventh Circust requirements that the necessary specific Facts which demonstrate plaintiff claims are supported

by some of the documents defendants has possession of in which defendant are not willing to allow plaintiff acesses to (absent of) an order by this Honor-abie Court. Plaintiff has attempt to notify this Honorable Court through the Forms of motions " Production of documents"; "Appointment of Counsel"; Protection orders, etc. Due to these motion "denied" plaintiff has limit documention to substantiate [his] Claims
With proof [his] claims has merits
and this too effects / damage the
out come of this case and also makes
plaintiff subject to Futher potential harms at the hands of the prison officials. Many of the defendants whom are directly involve and/ or took part 9n Ethish process of inducing plaintiff Wright With psychotropic drugs) were and are allowed to step clearly out of the way; along with the many other M.H.M team employess whom part taken in the mental health evaluation, involuntary injection of psychotropic drugs, as Well as administered through Foodinitially initially. Many other reports defendant's and low defendant's co-workers and defendant's Counsel Written has not been included (For example Dr. Reeves and Dr. smith reports) in the medical/mental

health records sent to plaintiff. When defendant Burks called plaintiff wright to the infirmary defendant Burks allowed plaintiff approximately of three (3) and a half (1/2) (3/2) hours to review his prison File and was prewarned by officer Person if I have to leave for any reason I will not be permitted to return orders of defendant Burks. Within these (3/2) hours aloted only a portion of plaintiff prison file was made available to plaintiff to see, plaintiff written warden J. C. Giles Three (3) letters and has not received any response as of yet.

Plaintiff Wright Knows that the defendants -- M.H.M. team / employees work under the Control of the Alabama Department of Correction (here after refered to as (A.D.O.C.)) official and must Comply to Eheir orders when Safety is at risk. It is also common Knowledge that these defendants employed with M.H.M., Inc., must work in harmony with prison health services, Inc., and the D.O. C. officials. If this defendants M.H.M. and/or P.H.S. employees don't work harmoniously with D.O.C. officials A report to Wheir employer's may Cause a discontinue employment so as is these M.H.M. and P.H.S. employees best interest they go along with the

A.D.O.C. Officials and/or remain Silent even when these officials impede into and for pervent (there of) the medical/ mental Care treatment needed For plaintiff Wright and other same situated Inmaters). Defendant sanders talk with plaintIFF Wright on three (3) different Occation in the infirmary and at least two (2) times in the mental health unit/ Dorms For interview/montoring, It 95 Clearly simular that M.H.M. feam interacts With RHS. health Care providers Where in MH.M. Inc. employee(s) assign or prescribe psychotropic medication and P.H.S. Inc. employeds) distribute the medication through the pill Call line. Defendants Dr. Sanders and M.H.M., Inc. would have this Honorable Court to believe Itheir act totally independent of each other but 4+ 95 Factual that on many other interacting acts these defendant Work hand and hand With each other under separate supervision but under on sole Authority (D.o.C.).

Plaintiff Wright still awasts
Bobby Longshore, Sidney Williams,
Noncy McCreary, Stephen McGill,
Cliff Walker, Don McGriff and Jenifer
Garrett. -- Parole Board Members response
as defendants with respect to action
under taken in the denial of parole

to plaintiff on August 16,2004, based on False and mesleadeng en Formation inserted en a Pre-Sentence Investigation report (here after refer to as a (P.S.I.) report) by Corolyn Miles-Pruitt (probatton and parole Officer). It was stated by the Executive director of the parole Board William Segerest that mrs. C. Miles -- Prufft has retair.w.w Tetired leaving plantiff wright holding the bag" the effects of her past acts" When she was a probation and parole officer. Which Bhez inserted False, enronous, and misleading information into a P. S.I. report allegeng plagntiff Wright rape (his) Ex- Wife (Wife at that time) two (2) days prior to Enimal Communiting the Gaid) Burglary I and Assault II in which inmate Wright plead quity to with no knowledge defendant Pruitt had placed such information in the P.S.I. report as details of the (said) offenses which would cause any reader of his prison File to believe (Without any determining Facts to Support such claims) plaintiff Wright person, a burglar but also a rapest. This information has cause plaintiff major Set backs, many other defferculties on preson to the extent he has had to Feied

a Civil Suit involving Violation of a liberty interest (absent due process) due to land acts of retaliation. Plaintiff Wright was subjected to Force psychotropic medications (in the absent of a Court order) to dessolve said complaint (99. D-1405-N; Richard Wayne Wright Sr. - VS-Tames Deloach, et. al.) by chemically design medication (psychotropic drugs) proor to the evidentiary hearing by the presiding Judge, leaving these! those 9ssue/clapms vacated by dis-rupting plaintiff thought pattern. Which was said (as I recall) on one occation 9+ 95 or was to prerequisite to predict Ahat (such) in Formation Would have a barring on any parole Consideration in the Future. Not only did it Cause plaintiff wright problems With Classification Criterias but also where used to set plagntiff wright next parole Consideration date OFF to Five (5)
years later after plagntiff Wright was
denied parole on August 16, 2004. This
Five (5) year 'set OFF' date 45 a policy applied on him by the said parole board members which was/were no such policy at the time of the scheduling of the initial Consideration date. Defenddants Bobby Longshore, Sidney Williams Noncy Mc Creary, Stephen McGill, Cliff

Walker, Don McGriff and Jenifer Garrett Failed to respond to the Court order passed down on January 6, 2006 in Which this Honorable Court Torder, an answer to plaintiff Wright Complaint be Filed by Feburary 3, 2006 upon defendants, See (Ethibits (6) and (7)

Plaintiff Wright has petition thes Honorable Court Through the Forms of Many motton Concern This I safety, (First and Far most) Which Consist of the preservance of his life. Next plaintiff Wright health Which must be both perserved For any practise OF liberty. Plaintiff Wright had hope thes Honorable Court Would do some thing to ensure the slightest Form implemented For this? safety. Plain-tiff Wright has lost several hundred dollars through the expense of Court Cost, Medical Co-payment designed by P. H.S., Inc. and expense of stamps and Copies Fee's. It has already been establish (See Exhibit Five (5)) that Department of Corrections does not have specfic legal authority to charge these Fees. The report recommends that in the Future, the department charge inmates only Fees authorized by law. These defendants Whom Work For P.HS. Inc. Mrs. Burks

Dr. Rayapati, M.D., ect. It appears this department of Correction V.C.F. and Staff Collects these Fee's through P.H.S., Inc. It Common knowledge that if inmates working are prohibited For medical Co-payment Charges of(3) Surely inmate's unable to get payed For their labor should be pronibited as well. When in Fact plaintiff which receives money periodically from Family members whom already pays state taxes and again been tax through P.H.S., Inc., ect. because they have Family incarcerated For Crime they must pay double.

Dlaintiff Was Sent to Mrs. Burks by Warden J.C. Giles here at V.C.F. to discuss his concern and Complaints about Inisd health due to Consecutive testing of T.B by means of April Apripol Aplisol Ltuberculin PPD, diluted) (skin test). With reported side effects. This took place on May 5, 2005 after wards plaintiff was lock in segregation for Forty-Five (45) days. It is discovered on March 24th 2006 and March 27th 2006 disciplinary hearing location that Nurse Burks (HS.A) states she has no known-ledge of any Complaints nor A Nurse Marsh and Willingly and Knowingly gave False statement under oath. If appears

Some one has design plaintiff Wright to be Mrs. Burks personal project and she is Causing plaintiff great distress at times then at other times she address plaintiff Complaint promply and adequately for example the past two reschedule doctor appointments has been arrange by defendant Burks. This put plaintiff Wright Often in bewilderment as to defendant Burks Character in relation to her Job Status. Defendant Burks did inform me upon the last reschedule appointment to see Dr. Rayapati and not Dr. Flord "She would not scheduled me another appoint unless I filled out another Sick Call Slip and pay the 3 dollars Co-payment Fee.

Plaintiff Wright must end this response at this point For 9F he places to many pages in one envelope 9t Shall not be mail to this Honorable Court as planned.

Done this the 28th day of March 2006.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard Wayne Wright Sr. #187140

Ventress Correctional Facility

Infirmary Roum # 103

Post Office Box 767

Page 13 OF

Certificate of Service

This is to Certify that I am the Plaintiff in the above encaptioned response and Certify III have sent this Response to the Clerk of this Court and earnestly ask due to Plaintiff indigent status that this Honorable ourt Forward a copy of this Response" To defendant is William Sanders and Mental Health Management Service, Inc., Special Report" to the Following:

Gregory F Yayhma: ASB-2411-H67G Scott Sullivan, Streetman & Fox, P.C. 2450 Valley dale Road Birgningham, Alabama 35244

Troy King (Attorney General)
State Bar # ASB - 5949 - 5615
Steven Mallette Sirmon
Assistant Attorney General
Hugh Davis (Attorney)
Alabama Board Pardon and Paroles
Post Office Box 302405
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

David B. Block (ASB -5098-K62D)
William R LunsFord (ASB-4265-L72L)
Douglas B. Hargett (ASB-9928-531H)
Page 14 of

Balch & Birgham LLP Post Office Box 18668 Huntsville, Alabama 35804-8668

Kim T Thomas Gregory Marion Biggs Alabama Department of Correction Legal Drugsion 301 Ripley Street Montgomery, Alabama 36130

by placing said response in the hand OF an infirmary on duty officer to place this in the "Legal mail box" located in the dinning hall, For postage to be provided by the proper prison officials here at V.C.F. and properly address this on the 28th day of March, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Wayne Wright, ST. # 187140 Plaintiff, Pro-Se.